

ANOTHER FACE OF JANUS

(The Nature of Leadership and its Relation to Management)

Armen E. Petrosyan

I. A Critique of the Prevalent Approaches¹

Abstract

Leadership is not a function of management. While leader qualities constitute an integral part of the arsenal of many non-managers a good deal of managers does not evince such abilities in carrying out their everyday duties. Nor are leaders alter egos of managers, deciding what are right things - in contrast with the latter having to do things rightly. The elaboration of objectives as an inseparable component of the planning is one of the primary tasks of managers. Those not determining what must be done, automatically turn into ordinary performers.

The reverse of the same medal is the representation of managers as formal leaders differing from “standard” ones only in being endowed with certain official power over the staff. But without formal regulation of rights and duties no complex order is attainable. As a result, the organization gets deprived of its hierarchical structure and transmutes into a primitive association.

So, no one of the prevailing approaches provides some distinct comprehension of the nature of leadership. That's why an insistent necessity arises to suggest fresh theoretical perspectives capable of representing both leadership and management within a single framework and showing them as different but kindred means of influencing people.

Omnis habet geminas, hinc atque hinc,
janua frontes,

E quibus haec populum pectat,
at illa larem.

Publius Ovidius Naso. Fasti.²

The problem of leadership and its part in the organizational life is, up to now, of the most knotty matters. Already in early 1970s, R. Stogdill wrote that there were almost as much definitions of leadership as those who tried to define it.³ During more than three decades elapsed since then, the number of definitions only grew while the rapport between them became progressively less. And nowadays the voices are heard that the nature of managers and leaders is a quite moot idea and there are no coherent viewpoints on what they have to do and what makes them act in such a way.

So, G. Salaman is of opinion that a clear vision of the nature of leadership never will appear because “such definitions arise not from organizational or technical requirements (which are themselves the product of manager's theory of organization), but from the shifting ways in which over time these functions are variously conceptualized. The manager, as much as the worker, is a product of history”.⁴ It comes out that all is relative. Today people look at management and leadership from one standpoint but under other conditions their ideas will change. And this kind of attitude is irrespective of the nature of organizations and their “technical requirements”. Should one wonder that definitions of leadership not only proliferate but are, for the most part, very distant from the real practice of organizations?

¹ First published in: Credo New. 2010. N 3.

² Ovid. The Fasti of Ovid. L.: Macmillan, 1909. P. 6.

Every door has two faces, this and that,
Whereof one looks outwards and the other inwards.

³ Stogdill R. M. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. N. Y.: Free Press, 1974. P. 259.

⁴ Salaman G. Competences of Managers, Competences of Leaders // Leadership in Organizations: Current Issues and Key Trends / Storey G. (ed.). L.: Routledge, 2004. P. 58.

Such a state of affairs is hardly tolerable in science. And, apparently, has come the time to elucidate this dark point. What is the nature of leadership? How it correlates to management? What are their places within an organization and how they interact at ruling people? Here are the main questions to be answered.

1. A Mere Managerial Function?

It had stricken root long ago to reduce leadership to one of the management functions. So, in the middle of the past century, W. Puckey asserted that any manager must be a leader. At that, he meant by the leader a person who forestalled his people “without being too far ahead from the others”.⁵ Puckey suggested also another, more comprehensive definition. According to him, “a leader is one who generates, within himself, the necessity for a decision; the action necessary to implement that decision; and in others the willing acceptance of that decision”. The matter concerns, in fact, one of the most important functions of management. related to initiative and the ability to carry people, by dint of the “inspirational quality”, or “personal magnetism”, in the course of appointing the task and organizing the work. But since both initiative and magnetism may be employed for good as well as for bad “the true manager” must have some other qualities.⁶ Hence, the leader-like actions constitute not only an integral part of the managerial potential but also a key function of management.

Indeed, there is a kind of logic in such an argumentation. The manager influences his subordinates, motivates, mobilizes and directs them to achieving the formulated and implicit objectives. Under like conditions, it is very hard to do without some leader behavior. Just owing to it manager “kindles” the workers and obtains, from them, some essential outcomes when the circumstances seem to impede his efforts. However it is easy to notice that the leader forms of acting, being often vitally important to the successful management, overstep its proper general framework.

What is the function of a system? It is the task for which the system is destined, what is accomplished in the course of its activity. As regards management its mission consists in ensuring the organizational goals’ attainment. Manager sets objectives, organizes the work directed to their fulfillment, and controls its course and results. And what may be said about leadership? It has to inspire and enlist the diligence of workers. Leader “attunes” and inclines them to do all their best to promote the common business.

Therefore, leadership, undoubtedly, supports the managerial functions but is not one of them. Furthermore, it represents only a means of accomplishing the manager’s mission - along with many others (the special knowledge, the ability to grasp the situation, the skills of handling technical devices, and so on). True, the role of leadership in management processes is so considerable that it acquires, inevitably, a heightened status. But it means not in the least that leadership ceases to be a tool of manager and turns into an end in itself.

It is common knowledge that not all managers possess leader qualities. Sometimes, they say about a manager: “He is a good employee, competent and skilled. But he is not a leader”. Does it mean that such a manager is a useless person? Not a bit. To some extent, he is capable of performing his tasks quite well without distinct leader-like behavior. Certainly, leader qualities are nearly always desired but not necessary at the lowest and, especially, at the middle levels of management.

No doubt, the importance of leader behavior is increased as a manager goes up to the top of the organization. And it becomes an obvious necessity for many executives. However

⁵ Puckey W. What is this Management? L.: Chapman & Hall, 1944. P. 19.

⁶ Puckey W. What is this Management? P. 40 – 41.

even in respect of the latter, it is very difficult to put everything right and unambiguously. There are a host of organizations having subordinate or stable goals (e. g. a daughter enterprise producing components and spares for its “parent” or the survey office of a governor, destined to attend on his administration). Even their first persons can easily do without any charisma.

Similarly, not all leaders are managers. The most convincing example is a preacher conducting huge crowds but, in the same time, not trying to obtain further insight into the life order of his followers. Jesus Christ, as Gospels say, felt the burden of routine and came angry when his disciples turned to him for utilitarian wants. His living, wrote E. Keedy, an author who studied moral leadership, “was wholly valorous, heroic. He himself suffered the loss of all things for God’s sake. He was poor and homeless, hated, betrayed, put to death; but he was the most tranquil and joyous of men, who despised this shame as a light affliction, and took reproach for God as a great joy”.⁷ Jesus did not aspire at the power nor had he a need for managing his followers - in the ordinary sense. He had not been going to set their mind to carry out some specific tasks or to distribute, among them, some current duties. They were not supervised by him. Christ did not appreciate the followers’ conduct in a permanent order, as well as reward or punish them.

Clear, Jesus was able to sate a crowd with a few loaves but he looked reproachful at those who thought of worldly rather than of divine things. And only after his death and ascension, there appeared a need to put in order the affairs of his disciples’ community for it acquired some property structure and a hierarchy of authorities. The same may be said about other preachers – John the Baptist, Buddha, Mahatma Gandhi.

So, what a function of management is leadership if it, being inherent in activity of many non-managers, nevertheless passes a sizable part of managers by? And why it differs thus much from their other functions?

Can one imagine a manager – even of the lowest rank (such as a foreman or a head of a small office) – who does not, though badly and lubberly, set objectives, find ways and means of achieving them, coordinate workers’ activity, and monitor it? Scarcely ever. Even if such a person is found he will be recognized, right away, as one falling short of his job’s requirements. But, if so, for what reason to add to the triad “planning – organization – control” one more - mythical - “directing” function connected with leadership?

2. An Alter Ego of Management?

Apparently, the clear realization of the unfitness of such a treatment of leadership has brought, last time, to a new current. A number of authors have acquired a firm conviction that it needs to distinguish between management and leadership as different activities. Although interrelated, they represent two quite independent phenomena and no one of them may be dissolved in the other.

It is believed that this tradition of opposing leaders and managers traces to A. Zaleznik. According to him, leader is an artist who squeezes his way in organizational jungles with the help of creation and intuition while manager simply solves problems, guided by rationality and control.⁸ True, it is acknowledged that management and leadership can be concentrated in the same person. However, as it is deemed, such a situation is neither unique nor surprising. Financier often lives in harmony, inside himself, with merchant, designer with

⁷ Keedy E. E. Moral Leadership and the Ministry. Boston (MA): Horace Worth, 1912. P. 34.

⁸ Zaleznik A. 1977. Managers and Leaders: Are They different? // Harvard Business Review. Vol. 55. № 3. P. 67 – 78.

engineer, and so on. As to scientists they can be not only mathematicians or economists but also biochemists and geophysicists.

Sometimes, it is heard that “leaders create and articulate vision” while “managers ensure it is put into practice”.⁹ The others emphasize the dynamical aspect of the subject. In their opinion, management “produces a degree of predictability and order” whereas leadership creates “change, often to a dramatic degree”.¹⁰ Hence, managers do not relate to leadership at all, as well as leaders stay apart from management. Their interplay resembles the relations between designer developing projects and technologist elaborating the prerequisites and opportunities for their implementation.

Moreover, this opposition is brought, at times, to its logical end. Then leader appears as a catalyst focused on strategy while manager becomes a simple performer. In A. Bryman’s words, the latter is an “operator”, or a “technician” concerned with the “here-and-now of operational goal attainment”.¹¹ Otherwise, leaders establish what to do and managers do what has been established by those.

W. Bennis and J. Goldsmith go further. According to them, “there is a profound difference – a chasm - between leaders and managers. A good manager does things right. A leader does the right things. Doing the right things implies a goal, a direction, an objective, a vision, a dream, a path, a reach”. Management relates to the efficiency and leadership to the effectiveness. The first is associated with the “How” while the second with the “What” and “Why”. Managers concern with “systems. controls, procedures. policies, and structures. Leadership is about trust - about people”, what means “innovating and initiating”. Thus “leadership is creative, adaptive, and agile”. It “looks at the horizon, not just the bottom line”.¹²

Nevertheless, despite so rigid, categorical, and, in the same time, far-reaching conclusions, no serious reasons are brought to support them, and – what is much more important – no distinct criteria are adduced. How to differ managers from leaders? The question remains suspended.

Clear, it is possible, if desired, to regard as such criteria the “How”, “What”, and “Why” as well as the opposition of the concepts “efficiency” and “effectiveness”. But, unluckily, these criteria appear even more blurry than what is compared with them. Really, the efficiency is associated with the right performance (how to do), and the effectiveness with the right setting of objectives (what and why to do). It means that the leader formulates a task, and the manager accomplishes it. However we have gotten used to think that the objective setting is one of the basal functions of management, as a part of the planning.¹³ But here it is committed entirely to leaders.

Rather odd looks a manager having discontinued to remain true to himself and turned into a performer. His chief care is, now, how to achieve the goal preset. Is it reasonable or well-founded? This question exceeds the bounds of his competence.

The picture is plain and has, in fact, nothing of new. It only renames the figures. Manager is called leader and the performer – manager.

More explicit and less defenceless looks the position of J. Kotter. As he states, “leadership is different from management, but not for the reason most people think.

⁹ Syrett M., Hogg C. (eds.). 1992. *Frontiers of Leadership: An Essential Reader*. Cambridge (MA): Blackwell, 1992. P. 5.

¹⁰ Conger J. A. *Learning to Lead: The Art of Transforming Managers into Leaders* San Francisco (CA): Jossey – Bass, 1992. P. 20.

¹¹ Bryman A. *Leadership and Organization*. L.: Routledge, 1986. P. 6.

¹² Bennis W. G., Goldsmith J. *Learning to Lead: A Workbook on Becoming a Leader*. Reading (MA): Perseus, 1997. P. 4.

¹³ See, f. e.: Drucker P. F. *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*. N. Y.: Harper Collins, 1999. P. 400.

Leadership isn't mystical and mysterious. It has nothing to do with having charisma or other exotic personality traits. It's not the province of a chosen few. Nor is leadership necessarily better than management or a replacement for it; rather leadership and management are two distinctive and complementary activities. Both are necessary for success in an increasingly complex and volatile business environment".

Besides, Kotter suggests relatively distinct criteria for distinguishing between managers and leaders. In his opinion, manager ensures the goals to be achieved and is provided with authorities for such a function whereas leader, forecasting the future, "grasps" and formulates the strategic guidelines for the organization. The task of manager consists in recruiting and appointing the staff while leader provides it with a common vision and prospects of development, preparing people to the future changes. "Management is about coping with complexity" while "leadership, by contrast, is about coping with change".¹⁴ Manager controls the subordinates and accounts for outcomes they secure. As to leader he mobilizes and inspires the workers, encouraging them to act with an increasing output.

At that, the key difference of leader from manager is reduced to that people follow him of their own free will. Leader has no warrant to reward or punish them. Nevertheless, they entrust themselves to the leader, accepting his demands. As regards manager he rests upon a formal authority. It is just this power that gives him to force the subordinates to accomplish the objectives set.

This picture of interrelations of management and leadership seems, by first sight, to be well-shape and sound. But, in reality, management is split up into two components. The first embraces its technical side (problem-solving, planning, budgeting, staffing, controlling, etc.) and the second deals with the personal (motivating, inspiring, directing, aligning people to a shared objective). However the illusion of impeccability gets dispelled as soon as the criteria suggested find some application.

Indeed, if management concerns the technical aspect of the organizational life and leadership mates the personal one, does it mean that managers do not play, in their professional activity, any interpersonal role? Is manager an insensitive robot, some technical shuttle scurrying about the administrative machine or he communicates also to his subordinates? Does manager only issue directives or he discusses the decisions with the workers, as well? And leader – is he somehow gotten involved with the technical proceedings or merely hovers over the organization and declares his precepts from the height?

Is it possible, in principle, to differentiate structurally the technical and the interpersonal parts of management? Does it not resemble the attempts to separate the soul from the body? After all, the interpersonal is only a component of the administrative system and, having lost it, the latter will, inevitably, cease to work.

Thus, it must be admitted that Kotter makes an ordinary logical error. One structural element of a system is opposed not to another element but to that system on the whole. As a consequent, the system itself is reduced to the status of a structural element. And as regards the functions of the system they shrivel like a piece of shagreen leather.

3. Formal and Informal Leadership

The Kotter's conception contains also another – implicit – axis of the opposition between leadership and management. The key peculiarity of leader is perceived in that people follow him of their own free will. He does not possess any power to reward or punish

¹⁴ Kotter J. P. A Force for Change: How the Leadership Differs from Management. N. Y.: Free Press, 1990. P. 103 – 104.

them. Nevertheless they entrust themselves to him, accepting his demands. As to manager he relies on a formal authority due to which compels, from them, the achievement of the goals set.

But the differentiation of the formal and the informal leaders is not something new. It is rooted in the early investigations of leadership. In a textbook first published in the middle of the past century, which held once much favour, it is pointed out that the mission of leadership consists in rallying people and forming social groups. The authors emphasize that this task could be accomplished both by taking up an official position and owing to the workers' recognition of the leader's "personal excellence" – a quality "that give them confidence in him and make them willing to accept his influence".¹⁵

The duality of ways to influence the workers determines also the difference between the "natural" and the "formal" leadership. It is admitted that often "these two kinds of influence are combined to a greater or lesser degree", though.¹⁶ But whatever the "origin" of a leader may be, he appears as "the recognized representative of his working group in its relationships with the rest of the organization or with persons outside the organization". The leader becomes the centre of attraction ("a rallying point") in the group, a symbol of its "oneness".

True, the officially appointed head of a unit or the organization as a whole has a number of advantages and, therefore, can get acknowledgment more likely. "However his position in the organization, and the fact that he is designated from "outside" place him in a position somewhat different from that of informal natural leaders. In the first place, his desires for further advancement urge him to identify with larger organization units rather than with the groups of his subordinates. In the second place, the membership in other working groups of executives may create competing pulls on his loyalties".¹⁷ That is to say, the formal status of the manager and his "imposedness" to the workers provoke a kind of estrangement between himself and his group. On the one hand, anxious for moving up through the scale of rank, any manager associates himself not so much with his people as with the guiding body of the organization. On the other hand, regularly taking part in the activity of various other groups (for instance, of committees and commissions consisting from just like formal leaders), he increasingly becomes surrounded by interests that frequently conflict with the aspirations of his subordinates.

It is presumed that the "natural" leader is free of such contradictions. As distinct from the formal one, he stays in one – "horizontal" - dimension (together with his colleagues) and does not scurry along two axes – "horizontal" and "vertical" (administrative) – at once. But, in return, his opportunities to influence the life of the organization remain, on the whole, less significant - at least under normal conditions.

Certainly, between formal and informal leaders no insuperable barrier is raised. So, in Kotter's opinion, they act side by side in the same organization and secure – by common efforts – its advancing development. Furthermore, "the smart companies value both kinds of people and work hard to make them part of the team". In principle, these qualities permit of being combined even within a single person. And organizations "can begin to groom their top people to provide both".¹⁸ And, concentrated in a manager, these qualities should be a pledge of a higher effectiveness of his activity.

¹⁵ Simon H. A., Smithburg D. W., Thompson V. A. Public Administration. New Brunswick (NJ): Transaction Publishers, 1991. P. 103.

¹⁶ Simon H. A., Smithburg D. W., Thompson V. A. Public Administration. P. 104.

¹⁷ Simon H. A., Smithburg D. W., Thompson V. A. Public Administration. P. 105.

¹⁸ Kotter J. P. What Leaders Really Do // Syrett M., Hogg C. (eds.). Frontiers of Leadership: An Essential Reader. Camb. (Mass.): Blackwell, 1992. P. 16 – 17.

However the recognition of informal leadership as “natural” – in contrast to official leadership that has only to play this role – creates a quite fertile field for various misunderstandings. Moreover, the figure of manager acquires some much dubious features. He intrudes, without ceremony, into an alien scope unnatural to him in order to secure the solution of his problems but, at the same time, possesses, from the very outset – already by the fact of his appointing to the position, some trump cards that are obtained by those acting “by nature” by the sweat of their brow, thanks to their personal merits and successful experience.

Thereby, leadership is not merely splintered into the formal and the informal. A separate “institutionalization” of each of these components occurs. The formal leadership gets attached to management and the informal turns out a “pure” manifestation of the proper nature of leadership. In fact, an exceptionally moral status is attributed to the informal leadership. As to the persons having any organizational authorities, their leadership is regarded, without reserve, as being of a formal nature.

But what means the moral leadership? As states one of its investigators, such a leader “interprets men to themselves, make them aware of their ideals, and converts their vague dreams into definite aims of conduct”.¹⁹ The moral leader suggests his followers respect and trust. They move themselves after him not because he can reward or punish them. They believe him to be a right person whose word and proceeding do not disagree. People have no doubt that their leader knows where they must go, and is willing, sincerely, to wend his way along with followers, not keeping a separate side-track for himself.

But are the formal leaders entirely devoid of these qualities? Surely no, and the proponents of the division of leadership into the formal and the informal scarcely will deny it. However such a manager, as they see him, merely combines, in himself, the both “projections” – in spite of the latter’s incompatibility. How he should carry subordinates, bearing an irreconcilable opposition within himself, - remains an abysmal mystery.

In any organization, managers are endowed with certain authorities over the subordinates. But not in the least because manager as a person, irrespective to his official power, is worth nothing, and not only because this power is a necessary means of influencing workers. If he does not have some distinctly defined authorities a chaos can arise within the sphere of his responsibility. And, then, the organization will lose, ultimately, its hierarchical structure and turn into a primitive association of “free shots”.

But can one say that manager is able to stand at the head of an organization or its any unit only through getting endowed with formal authorities? It is scarcely so. Otherwise no bad managers would exist. Even the most useless of them, have they wider and stronger authorities, would succeed. But, unfortunately, nothing like occurs.

Now, let us imagine the opposite. Suppose, in an organization, one of the workers has obtained a high moral authority and the trust of his colleagues, without possessing any official power. All they are willing to follow him anywhere by his first call. He needs only to suggest something - that becomes, at once, unquestionable for the others.

May one regard such a situation as a good for the organization? Definitely no. It is a bomb of delayed-action. What has to feel, at that, the manager as a “formal leader”? His status is entirely lowered. He can do nothing against his unofficial contender. This manager should either ingratiate himself with the latter or cease to fulfill his own duties.

Actually, the both ways bring to the mess and loss of controllability, although nominally the hierarchical structure of the organization is still kept. Thereby, it becomes a non-sense to demand something from the official leader for, in reality, he has nothing to

¹⁹ Griggs E. H. Moral Leaders. N. Y.: Abingdon Press, 1940. P. 11.

manage. In the same time, the informal leader who practically rules the people has nothing to count for.

The unofficial leadership in organizations is acceptable only to a limited extent. As soon as it begins to threaten the status and the authorities of the management such a “guerilla” becomes too disastrous to neglect it. Clear, the point is not of some draconian measures to suppress the wills of the persons involved. However an apathetic attitude to such a situation leads, inevitably, to the erosion of the working interrelations and, in the end, to disorganization.

Opposing leaders to managers, a proponent of the dichotomy “formal – informal power” substitutes, in fact, their real interrelations for the collision of the official and unofficial leaders. Meantime, the informal leaders represent, in a sense, an anomaly, an evident deviation from the established order. And they may not be considered a full part of the management system.

Sure, it would be silly to underestimate the informal leaders and, all the more, to neglect them. Further still, it is completely inadmissible to repress or to extirpate them. After all, the unofficial structure arises not on someone’s whim but as a response of the organization to the task assigned to it. When the official structure does not cope with the demands of the situation the organizational system is reshaped, making up the deficiencies of the initial pattern.

Thus, if the informal leader does not overstep some limits he can be of essential benefit for the organization, filling gaps in the official channels of information and influence. Nevertheless it is not worth of turning all on its head and place the informal leader above the formal. If something like is met in an organization it is only a token of the “revolutionary situation” – the diarchy that implies, in fact, an alternative manager. And this circumstance is fraught with quite serious effects inauspicious for the organization.

If the diarchy is caused by that the manager is rather bad and does not endure the demands made of him by his position he must be displaced without delay. And if the informal leader manifests, in addition, a skill to direct his colleagues in a right way it means that there is a ready candidate to the position to be freed. But, in any case, the informal leader should be given no opportunity to raise his real status (potential of influence on the workers) at the expense of the formal head of the organization or one of its units.

If the manager evinces a pronounced leader behavior, and it seems to get blended successfully with the features of a strong administrator the organization seems to be lucky. Owing to such “universality”, the manager gets an opportunity not merely arrange his relations with the collective more supply, especially under the conditions of great changes, but also to lower the pressure on the managerial hierarchy from below. However it does mean not in the least that such a manager combines the roles of the formal and informal leaders.

What the meaning of the leader behavior of a manager consists in? It implies that he ensures the achievement of the organizational goals, availing himself of his charisma, prestige, and influence on people. Otherwise – if the “unofficial” actions begin to prevail in the manager’s practice, and he displays a willingness to disregard the interests of the organization for the sake of strengthening his own popularity or consolidating the subordinates’ trust in his potential the manager turns, actually, into an informal leader. Meanwhile, the formal leader having become his own antipode, poses even a greater danger to the organization than any informal leader capable of plunging the organization into the abyss of diarchy or, rather, anarchy.

Anyway, the figure of manager is split in two halves. A “natural” leader is squeezed out of it, which being only a part of the managerial spirit, at that not a necessary one, turns into an separate “unit” and acquires some independent existence. But when the leader ego is

detached from the managerial one, without quitting their common body, they inevitably collide with each other. And this is nothing else than a “functional schizophrenia”. And the single way to overcome such a disease is to settle the “untethered” leader ego back into the managerial “soul”. Only in such a way, it is possible to return to a sound understanding of leadership as an instrument of ruling people.

The Intermediate Totals

Leadership should not be considered a managerial function. While leader qualities constitute an integral part of the arsenal of many non-managers a good deal of managers themselves does not evince such abilities at carrying out their everyday tasks. The leader behavior remains alien to these managers. Similarly, only a few leaders are associated with administrative practice, though.

Leadership cannot be regarded as the reverse of management, as well. In the light of such an interpretation, leaders appear as those deciding what to do, formulating the right tasks while managers are called for to find the right ways and means of fulfilling them and to organize, properly, the practical work. But the goal-setting as an integral part of the planning is one of the most important functions of management. Those managers who does not take part in drawing up guidelines and elaborating plans, automatically passes into the category of performers. And their place in the organization goes to leaders.

It is left to managers to employ, still, the routine planning, create the necessary conditions for the joint activity of their subordinates, and control their work. As to leaders they should focus on generating the strategic goals, motivating and inspiring the workers, initiating profound changes, and monitoring the development of events from the “bird’s-eye” view. Thereby, the nature of manager breaks out, in fact, into a properly managerial and a leader one. However, after losing an essential part of its potential, management hardly can be successful.

Another variation on the same theme is portraying managers as formal leaders which differ from the “natural” (in the true sense) in that they are endowed with some power toward their subordinates. But this power is intended not for the same influence the informal leaders exert. Without a formal regulation of the rights and duties of the organization’s members no order is feasible. The organization devoid of its hierarchical structure degenerates into a primitive association.

But does manager rule his people only thanks to the official authorities? If so, where bad managers come from? Under such conditions, their professional failure always can be made up through the enlargement and consolidation of their power. Besides, if an “informal” person gets more influence than the “formal” leader these advantages if the first are obtained at the expense of the latter. And, as a result, it becomes senseless to set up claims to any of them. The real potential of the manager is, actually, emasculated and his informal “rival” accountable to nobody.

But that is not a sole point. The informal leadership in an organization is a permanent peril. It cannot be removed in full. Moreover, sometimes such a leadership is of use, filling the gaps of the practice. Nevertheless, the presence of “informal” leaders demands from the heads of the organization to be all eyes. Elsewise, having crossed some critical threshold, the informal leadership will undermine all the managerial hierarchy.

As to manager he may not, in principle, be considered an informal (“natural”) leader. It would mean, to manager, to stand up in an irreconcilable opposition to his own self. And having gotten bogged, up to the neck, in the contradictions between the interests of the organization itself, on the one hand, and the subordinates carried with him, on the other hand,

he will have no choice but to toss, permanently, like the Bouridan's ass, about two extremes, what is a plain manifestation of the “functional schizophrenia”.

Thus, all these approaches to leadership bring to nonremovable failures and keep from obtaining any clear understanding of its nature. In spite of their external solidity, they confront with difficulties as soon as get applied to the realities of the organizational life. Just this circumstance causes an urgent request to advance some fresh theoretical views allowing to grasp leadership and management by a single glance and to represent them as some different but kindred modes of influencing people.